

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

PAMELA S BYGNESS

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-08602-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

COMMUNITY & FAMILY RESOURCES

Employer

**OC: 08/05/07 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the August 29, 2007, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on September 25, 2007. Claimant participated with Maria Weydert. Employer participated through Debra Roff and John Hostetler and was represented by Stu Cochrane, Attorney at Law. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 4 were received.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full time prevention specialist from January 17, 1990 until August 3, 2007 when she was discharged. On July 27 employer received an e-mail report of conversation with Patty Treibel, a minor agency funder and former employee, who said she had a conversation with claimant and Maria Weydert who allegedly told her "things were awful" at work and everyone is "looking elsewhere." (Employer's Exhibit 1) Claimant admitted she asked about any job openings and after Treibel said there were not and asked why, claimant replied only, "things aren't good." Weydert was present and confirms the conversation primarily based upon "small talk." There was a memo issued to all staff in April 2007 about being positive with the public but claimant had never been warned or accused of similar conduct in the past. (Employer's Exhibit 2) In December 2006 employer placed claimant on an involuntary medical leave through mid-March 2007, demoted her from her supervisory position and replaced her with Debra Roff.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Employment Appeal Board*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. This conduct was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment and inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant directly about any of the issues leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. The claimant was entitled to fair warning that the

employer was no longer going to tolerate her performance and conduct. Without fair warning, the claimant had no way of knowing that there were changes she needed to make in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The August 29, 2007, reference 01, decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs